



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,822	11/20/2000	Eron A. Jokipii	40914/DJS/Y62	2085
23363	7590	08/10/2004		
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			EXAMINER EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR	
			ART UNIT 2654	PAPER NUMBER 10
DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,822

Applicant(s)

JOKIPII, ERON A.

Examiner

Patrick N. Edouard

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 5/5/04 (paper #9).

Claims 1-33 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Because of the following reasons:

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, White et al teach a computer system comprising a translation table that provides text messages in different language using an associated text message system a database. Atkin et al teach a computer network comprising JILResource Bundle 210 that translates the user interface text into the request request human language utilizing a Web Server which includes a translation engine. Therefore, it would have it obvious to combine the teaching of White (i.e. a computer having a translation table) with the teaching of Atkin et al (a computer network wherein the translation table is a web server) because it would provide a localizing system that can provide support for a wide array of

Art Unit: 2654

languages dynamically selected at run time and without the need for modification of the application and also multiple users the capability to use the translation table since it is located in a network server.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1- 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White, III et al (6,493,661) in view of Atkin et al (6,490,547).

As per claims 1, 19, 26 and 28-33, White et al teach a system comprising:

“Wherein at least one of the plurality of computers comprises a conversion table (his text string database 13, col.2, lines 59-65, col. 3, lines 28-50, figure 3); the conversion table look up table comprising:

“A unique key value for each of a plurality of unique words of phrases” (figure 3, his identifier); and

“ a language key for at least one language” (his language such French, English);

"A plurality of text phrases each corresponding to a language key and a unique key value" (his text string)

"Wherein the at least one of the plurality of computers further programmed

"To receive a selection of a word or phrase" (his user 17, col. 3, lines 20-26);

"To convert the word or phrase into a unique key value using the conversion table" (figure 1, his specified language and text string identifier, col. 2, line 59 to col. 3, lines 7).

It is noted that White et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach a communication network connecting at least one of a plurality of network servers and at least one of plurality of computers" and " to transmit the unique key value to the network server". However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Atkin et al who teach in figure 1, a data processing network 102 includes one or more servers 104-106 and one or more clients 108-110 wherein JILResourcebundle 210 transmits to the server and HTTP message for each user interface text string requiring translation an identification of the source code and identification of the target language at col. 4, lines 15-29. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate the system of White in a network environment as taught by Atkin because it would provide a localizing system that can provide support for a wide array of languages dynamically selected at run time and without the need for modification of the application.

As per claims 2-3, 20 and 27, White et al teach wherein the conversion table comprises text phrases for only one language key (figure 3 and figure 1, his text string database 13).

As per claims 4-12, 21-23 and 25 the combination of White with Atkin teaches the network server is programmed to receive the unique key value from the computer and transmits the unique key value to a second of the at least one of the computers computer (White's figures 1 and 3, his text string database in combination with the networking of Atkin et al figure 1).

As per claim 13, White et al teach wherein the network server comprises a server conversion table comprising a unique key, a language key and a plurality of text phrases (figure 1, his text string database 13, figure 3).

As per claims 14-18 and 24 the combination of White with Atkin teaches the network server is programmed to receive the unique key from the computer...(The White's computer as described in figure 1 and 3 in combination of Atkin's network in figure 1).

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"

or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.- 6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the

Application/Control Number: 09/717,822

Page 6


Art Unit: 2654

examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

August 3, 2004



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER